



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,683	08/06/2002	Anthony Nikodym	22176/5	7216

21710 7590 03/19/2003

BROWN, RUDNICK, BERLACK & ISRAELS, LLP.
BOX 1P, 18TH FLOOR
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

ELVE, MARIA ALEXANDRA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1725

DATE MAILED: 03/19/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
10/064,683

Applicant(s)
Nikodym

Examiner
M. Alexandra Elve

Art Unit
1725



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall et al. (US Pat. 4,800,131) in view of Church (US Pat. 4,463,243).

Marshall et al. discloses a welding wire having a metallic sheath enclosing a core wire and filler powder materials. Wire are drawn to diameter ranges of 3/32 and 5/64. Arc stabilizers are added to the composite wires and include graphite, potassium and nickel compounds. These types of compounds are present in amounts of up to about 3.5 percent by weight of the total wire. Other materials contained in the wire is manganese and silicon. Marshall et al. does not teach the exact composition as instant claims or ampere values.

Church discloses a welding system in which an electric arc system uses gas mixtures of argon and carbon dioxide. The electrode currents are in the range of 100 to 1100 amperes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the

Art Unit: 1725

welding standards as taught by Church in the Marshall et al. wire weld system because these are merely variations of welding parameters.

The exact amounts of each of the constituents as presently claimed are not disclosed in the prior art; however, the prior art compositions closely approximate or overlap applicant's claimed composition. It has been held that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have considered the claimed compositions to have been obvious because close approximation or overlapping ranges in a composition is considered to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. See In re Malagari, 182 USPQ 549, Titanium Metals v. Banner 227 USPQ 773, In re Nehrenberg 126 USPQ 383.

3. Claims 11-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Church (US Pat. 4,463,243) in view of Marshall et al. (US Pat. 4,800,131).

Church discloses a welding system in which an electric arc system uses gas mixtures of argon and carbon dioxide. The electrode currents are in the range of 100 to 1100 amperes. A schematic of the system reveals a reel which supplies welding wire to a wire feed device which pushes the wire through a flexible conduit and the latter terminates into a welding gun. A power supply supplies current to the welding wire and includes normal voltage and amperage controls. A shielding gas tank supplies gas to a flow control device which in turn feeds the gas to a conduit

Art Unit: 1725

and the welding gun. Wires of tensile strengths 61 to 75 Kg/mm² are used, having wire diameters of approximately 1/16. Although Church discloses an electrode the specific composition is not taught.

Marshall et al. discloses a welding wire having a metallic sheath enclosing a core wire and filler powder materials. Wire are drawn to diameter ranges of 3/32 and 5/64. Arc stabilizers are added to the composite wires and include graphite, potassium and nickel compounds. These types of compounds are present in amounts of up to about 3.5 percent by weight of the total wire. Other materials contained in the wire is manganese and silicon. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a wire composition, as taught by Marshall et al., in the Church welding system, because these are merely variations on the types of welding wires available.

The exact amounts of each of the constituents as presently claimed are not disclosed in the prior art; however, the prior art compositions closely approximate or overlap applicant's claimed composition. It has been held that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have considered the claimed compositions to have been obvious because close approximation or overlapping ranges in a composition is considered to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. See In re Malagari, 182 USPQ 549, Titanium Metals v. Banner 227 USPQ 773, In re Nehrenberg 126 USPQ 383.

Art Unit: 1725

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Alexandra Elve whose telephone number is (703) 308-0092. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 6:30 AM to 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn, can be reached on (703) 308-3318.

Any inquiry of general nature to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.


M. ALEXANDRA ELVE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

March 15, 2003.